

273454

Butler, David

From: Zeigler, Belton <Belton.Zeigler@wbd-us.com>
Sent: Friday, December 08, 2017 2:28 PM
To: Butler, David; Hudson, Shannon; Nelson, Jeff; K. Chad Burgess; Matthew Gissendanner; mike.couick@ecsc.org; jtiencken@tienckenconway.com; Frank Ellerbe; bguild@mindspring.com; bguild@mindspring.com; Bholman@selcsc.org; ejones@selcsc.org; bcook@scag.gov; esmith@scag.gov; rtyson@sowellgray.com; sroberts@spilmanlaw.com; dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com; lbrandfass@spilmanlaw.com; Scott Elliott; DEX@smxblaw.com; alex@shissiaslawfirm.com; Mitch Willoughby; ssuggs@scjustice.org; john@johncoffman.net; fknapp@knappagency.com; TeagueLynn@gmail.com; Dino.Teppara@gmail.com; cmcdonald@tienckenconway.com; Richard Whitt; Richard Whitt; tfrogers@austinrogerspa.com; tfrogers@austinrogerspa.com
Cc: PSC_Attorneys; PSC_Technical Advisory; Wheat, Jo
Subject: RE: Oral Arguments Set for Tuesday, December 12, 2017

David:

I am writing concerning the oral argument scheduled for Tuesday, December 12, 2017 related to SCE&G's Motion to Dismiss in Docket No. 2017-305-E. The current scheduling order allows each party who filed a brief or letter 15 minutes to present its principal argument to the Commission. The order then allows ten minutes to the Movant to make a response to them all.

By my count, as many as eight parties opposing SCE&G motion will be allowed to argue. If all these parties use their allotted time, SCE&G would have ten minutes as Movant to respond to what could be two hours of argument made in opposition to its motion. If new points are raised in response to questions from the Commission to these parties, the burden on SCE&G in reply could be even greater.

For these reasons, it does not appear that the current allocation of time will allow SCE&G a fair or reasonable opportunity to respond to arguments or assertions that made by its eight opponents. Therefore, SCE&G would respectfully request that the order be amended to allow SCE&G up to 50% of the time taken by the other parties in their arguments in chief to make its reply. With only ten minutes as presently allowed, there is little chance that SCE&G will be able to make a complete, clear or appropriate reply .

SCE&G will, of course, only use such time as is required to fairly and appropriately respond to the issues raised and will respect the Commission's interest in conciseness and efficiency deciding how much reply is needed. But given the importance of these matters, and the number of parties involved, it would seem necessary that the time given SCE&G be reasonable in light of the time given in total to the parties in opposition.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Belton

Belton Zeigler
 Partner
 Womble Bond Dickinson (US) LLP